



teaches away from this concept in that each fabric disclosed in Foy employs a balanced structure in which the denier of the warp yarn is equal to the denier of the fill yarn. For this reason, claim 1 is allowable.

Because claims 2-5 depend from and further limit claim 1, such claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 6 recites a protective fabric substrate comprising: a plurality of warp yarns densely interwoven with a plurality of fill yarns; wherein a warp crimp is greater than a fill crimp; and wherein a denier of the fill yarn is greater than a denier of the warp yarn.

For the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1, claim 6 also is allowable over Foy.

Because claims 7 and 8 depend from and further limit claim 6, such claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 9 recites a protective fabric substrate comprising: a substrate including a plurality of warp yarns densely interwoven with a plurality of fill yarns; and a layer of epoxy resin applied to the substrate.

Foy neither discloses nor suggests a substrate of densely interwoven yarns which includes a layer of epoxy resin applied to the substrate. For this reason, claim 9 also is allowable.

Based on the foregoing, the present application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is

invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below to further the prosecution of this application in any respect.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy J. Pritzker
Randy J. Pritzker
Reg. No. 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA, 02210
(617) 720-3500
Attorney for Applicant(s)

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: W0490/7007

Dated: April 9, 1999

XNDD